DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 576 RC 014 182

AUTHOR Hernandez-Chavez, Eduardo; And Others
TITLE The Federal Policy Toward Language and Education: Pendulum or Progress? A Response to the de Kanter/Baker Review. Monograph No. 12.
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Sacramento. Cross-Cultural Resource Center.
PUB DATE Dec 82
NOTE 43p.; For related document, see ED 215 010.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Cognitive Development; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Immersion Programs; Intelligence; *Language Acquisition; Language Attitudes; Limited English Speaking; *Program Effectiveness; *Second Language Learning; Transitional Programs

ABSTRACT

A response to the de Kanter/Baker draft report, "The Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature," the monograph argues that: the report contains many misinterpretations of theoretical work in psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and educational research and of the empirical evidence on the efficacy of second language immersion and transitional bilingual education programs; theoretical notions are promoted by de Kanter/Baker which are not supported by evidence; the report is premature since it was prepared prior to the reporting of over 48 congressionally mandated studies of bilingual education; and there are blatant examples where de Kanter/Baker's own guidelines were violated in order to include information from methodologicaly inadequate studies that seemed to support the report's ideological positions. The monograph identifies de Kanter/Baker's "a priori" social and philosophical biases as the report's unifying force and concludes that these biases are the basis upon which its conclusions are reached. The monograph suggests that de Kanter/Baker's proposals amount to a return of the policy pendulum to the days before Title VII and do not contribute to a solution to the methodological and philosophical questions raised. A discussion of policy implications and the need for a cross-cultural understanding of the children's educational needs concludes the monograph. (Author/NQA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231576

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

A RESPONSE TO THE DEKANTER/BAKER REVIEW

THE FEDERAL POLICY TOWARD LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION: PENDULUM OR PROGRESS

EDUARDO HERNÁNDEZ - CHÁVEZ
JOSÉ LLANES
ROBERTO ALVAREZ
STEVE ARVIZU

RC014182

Cross Cultural Resource Center

Monograph No. 12

December 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jose Llanes
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Federal Policy Toward Language and Education: Pendulum or Progress?

Eduardo Hernández-Chávez

José Llanes

Roberto Alvarez

Steven F. Arvizu

CROSS CULTURAL RESOURCE CENTER

MONOGRAPH NO. 12

Department of Anthropology
California State University
6000 Jay Street
Sacramento, California 95819

The Federal Policy Toward Language and Education: Pendulum or Progress?

ABSTRACT

This monograph is a response to the widely circulated de Kanter/Baker draft report "The Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature" issued for the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Budget of the Department of Education.

We think a response is in order at this draft stage due to the publicity the report has received and the effect this publicity will have upon congressional hearings on the Title VII legislation which are about to begin. Our main points are as follows:

1) The de Kanter/Baker report contains many misinterpretations of theoretical work in psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and educational research as well as of the empirical evidence on the efficacy of programs of second language immersion and transitional bilingual education.

2) Theoretical notions are promoted by de Kanter/Baker which are not supported by evidence, such as the notion that non-language concepts can be easily learned non-verbally, that first language learning is dependent upon intelligence, and that bilinguals cannot attain levels of proficiency in L2 equal to those attained by monolingual L2 speakers.

3) The de Kanter/Baker report is premature since is was prepared prior to the reporting of over 48 congressionally-mandated studies of bilingual education, and in a sense, it represents a level of knowledge about the phenomenon of language in education already judged insufficient for policy analysis.

4) We agree with the emphasis upon rigorous methodological requirements for the studies to be reviewed, but we find blatant examples where de

Kanter/Baker's own guidelines were violated in order to include information from methodologically inadequate studies that seemed to support the Report's ideological positions.

5) Finally, we identify the a priori social and philosophical biases of de Kanter/Baker as the unifying force of the Report and conclude that these biases - disguised as empirical objectivity - are the basis upon which its conclusions are reached.

This monograph argues that progress certainly needs to be made in the methods used to educate limited and non-English speaking children but suggests that de Kanter/Baker's proposals amount to a return of the policy pendulum to the days before Title VII, disturbing in the process gains made by schools, classrooms and students, without contributing to a solution to the methodological and philosophical questions raised.

We conclude with a discussion of policy implications and the need for a cross-cultural understanding of the educational needs of children.

I. PENDULUM OR PROGRESS?

A study of the history of American Education reveals a tendency on the part of federal policy makers to move ahead on educational proposals and regulations before adequate evidence exists to substantiate the direction being taken. Historians view this as progress. Public mass-access education was progress, attention to foreign language learning in the 1950's was progress, attention to the teaching of basic skills in the 1970's was progress and so was transitional bilingual education, an experimental program designed to meet the needs of "limited and non-English speaking children." (P.L. 90-247 BEA 1968)

Invariably all this progress has led to the reorganization of the institutions that were to carry out the educational proposals and that had to struggle to operate within their regulations. State and local educational agencies learned to differentiate between Title I, II and VII; and classroom teachers everywhere acquired a new adjective..."my Title I students." Beyond the semantics, the

NOTE: This monograph represents a critical response to the de Kanter/Baker draft report available to us at the time of this critique: the Draft Final Report: The Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature, dated April 29, 1981. We understand that there is a later version from which some studies found in this draft are excluded and others not in the draft are included. However, the later draft was unavailable to us as of this writing. We are confident that, unless the substance of the report has changed, our comments will be applicable as well to the later draft. The page references below are all with respect to the labeled sections and pages of the April 29th draft. Since the later report is authored by both Baker and de Kanter, we will refer to "de Kanter/Baker" throughout the monograph, even though only de Kanter's name was on the earlier version.

changes brought about by the new educational policies become part of the classroom slowly. The districts, as all autonomous organizations responding to incentives tend to do, react even more slowly, and the States, empowered by the Constitution with the responsibility for education which the federal policy threatens to usurp, barely move at all during the first five years of a given mandated federal educational policy. This is true of the implementation of Title I and Title VII (Stallings, 1974; Danoff, 1978) and can be generalized to the history of other so-called equal educational opportunity policies.

Yet, while the policy is often resisted and the regulations delayed or ignored, some change does come from the new federal direction. Pilot projects often become programs, and successful classroom methods are diffused by networks of formal and informal exchange. It is often at this very moment that the federal policy reverses itself, often labeling this retreat as a new policy which is clearly nothing more than the pendulum swinging back to a time before the progress. As slowly and reluctantly as the original policy was accepted, the return swing of the pendulum is even harder to accept. The classroom cannot be easily restructured, restaffed, or retreaded. Little change can be expected in the basic pattern of interaction between teacher and student. In any case, the local educational agency responds to the local politics and attempts to strike a balance, and the State, ignobly gratified perhaps by the confessed error of the federal policy makers, is left with a problem to solve, a problem which by now everyone agrees..."is the responsibility of the States." (Reagan, 1980).

The de Kanter/Baker report is clearly an invitation to the Federal Government to abrogate the responsibility for the progress it has made toward equal educational opportunities. It is a reflection of the federal instinct to retreat behind the lines of popular politics, giving up the gains already made and ignoring all of the evidence it has paid dearly to collect. It is a panicky retreat.

Educational institutions and classrooms do not do well in this climate of abrupt pendulum swings in policy. Children deserve a steady and progressive policy, systematic in its approach and informed by its own data. The de Kanter/Baker Report fails to suggest new avenues of progress, both in the narrow policy sense - educating limited and non-English proficient students - and in the broader sense of a nationally coherent approach to language and education. It is typical of the type of bureaucratic pre-emptive striking which precedes policy battles with Congress, more in the vein of political positivism than scientific skepticism. Within the next few months, the Part C Committee, jointly staffed by the National Institute of Education and the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs and benefiting from wide inter-agency participation, will begin to interpret the policy implications of over 48 studies mandated by Congress and conducted by dozens of respected researchers, scholars and institutions. This mass of unprecedented data is still not reported and was not available for the April 29, 1981 de Kanter/Baker Report. Without these data, policy recommendations must be made as leaps of faith, from narrowly constrained findings, and are therefore subject to a large degree of error. What follows is a review of some of these errors.

II. THEORETICAL ISSUES

The Oral and Written Language Distinction. De Kanter/Baker use Cummins' (1978, 1980) argument that oral skills in L2 do not facilitate transfer to L2 writing skills in order to conclude that the development of oral skill in neither language will facilitate learning to read, either in L1 or L2. This represents a huge inferential leap and a misapprehension of the argument. Their assumption seems to be that no language is required for the child to learn to read; that learning to read for the first time can as easily be accomplished in a language the child does not know, as in one that the child knows. Transfer is one thing. Prerequisite knowledge is quite another.*

Cummins' formulation seems quite clear and to the point: the learning of oral skills in L2 does not mean the automatic acquisition - through transfer - of L2 written skills. Neither does it imply that L2 written skills can be acquired without prior development of oral skills in that language,** much less that literacy is attainable, in either language, without first having well developed oral skills in that language.

De Kanter/Baker include the distinction between oral and written language as one of their "relevant factors" principally because the age of learning affects these two skills differently. There are other, more important, reasons for

---

* In the linguistic literature, transfer normally refers to the use of skills in one language which were learned in another. It is generally considered necessary that the transferable skills be structurally similar and in the same (oral or written) modality. De Kanter/Baker are arguing against transfer across modalities within or between languages, which is irrelevant to Cummins' statement but crucial to their theoretical position. The argument is a red herring because it focuses the discussion on the false issue of supposed lack of transfer of skills from the oral to the written modality; it is a straw man in that the issue of transfer is never posed in this way.

** Though this may be true in a limited sense, especially for already literate persons.

distinguishing these skills, namely that they are learned by profoundly different processes, that there is a relation of priority for the oral modality, and that the learning of two skills has quite different implications for other kinds of learning.

Nevertheless, the inclusion of this as a relevant variable is well taken. It would have been desirable had de Kanter/Baker kept this important distinction in mind in evaluating the various studies. For example, in referring to the putative superiority of immersion over ESL and bilingual education, de Kanter/Baker make reference to oral skills since they bring to bear the notion of creative construction in language learning (V, 11). Yet in the critique of the studies they cite in support of this, they frequently fail to make it clear which modality of language is the object of study which in some cases is the oral modality, as in the Plante (1976) and the McAllen, Texas studies (Peña-Hughes, Smither, Solís, 1980), in others it is the written modality, as in the Philippine studies (Ramos et al., 1967), and in still others it is both (Modiano, 1968, 1973; JDRP, 1977a; Alejandro, 1979).

This point is important because, in arguing that language skills do not transfer from the oral to the written modality, de Kanter/Baker lay the groundwork for their claims that L1 is not necessary for the proper education of language minority children and that instruction in and through L2 from the beginning is the best approach. If learning to read does not depend on oral language, then it can be accomplished in any language. American children could just as easily learn to read in Arabic as in English (if they were at the same time being taught how to speak Arabic). Such a proposition is patently absurd, and it is possible to make only if the intricate relationships between written and oral skills in two languages are ignored.

Language and Cognitive Development. A great deal is made of the relation between language and cognition. De Kanter/Baker cite a number of studies that tend to show that thinking does not depend upon language, and expend considerable

effort in refuting the Whorfian Hypothesis. From this discussion, they again make an inferential jump to the conclusion that the child does not require language to learn conceptually; that a small amount of L2 is all that is necessary to learn mathematics and other subject matter; and that therefore the child's L1, even in the absence of more than a rudimentary L2, is quite unnecessary for learning.

This entire argument demonstrates either a serious distortion of the relevant facts about the language-cognition relationship or an equally serious lack of understanding of that relation. The Whorfian thesis and the debate about it center around the idea that language structure affects speakers' thought processes, not that cognitive development requires or does not require language. The latter is a distinct issue. And the fact that many kinds of thinking are not mediated through language does not obviate the clearly established relationship between all manner of abstract thought and language. Language development is both dependent upon conceptual development and greatly facilitates it (Slobin 1973). Were this not the case, we could dispense with language development entirely in our educational programs and proceed directly to the task of teaching concepts. Just how this would be done is a total mystery.

In the two sets of studies that de Kanter/Baker cite in support of the idea that a minimal amount of L2 is all that is necessary for children to be able to learn non-language concepts (the Canadian and Culver City studies), the conditions of learning are such that it is possible that no L2 is necessary. In both types of program, the children were from a majority language group of middle class parents who were very supportive of the immersion program. It would be difficult to imagine that these parents would not assist their children in their academic tasks - in their home language - especially in such a basic skill as mathematics. In such a a case, the child would need to understand very little of the material in the school setting in order to progress satisfactorily.

Here again, de Kanter/Baker's theoretical stance is determined by educational philosophy, and data is called upon to support it. According to de Kanter/Baker, immersion teaches concepts as it teaches a second language. The efficacy of this approach can follow only from a theory that holds language and cognition to be independent. Thus, the ideological tail is made to wag the pedagogical dog.

Intelligence and Language Learning. A notion related to language and cognition is that of the role of intelligence in language learning. Here, de Kanter/Baker take the contradictory position that intelligence is very important, i.e. that non-verbal cognitive processes impact on language. Consistency dictates that if cognition and language are independent, as de Kanter/Baker argue, then language learning should not depend upon intelligence. The Whorfian hypothesis, which they argue against, merely holds that language affects cognitive structure, and Slobin's proposition (1973) states that the child must acquire knowledge of semantic relations before the grammatical relationships of language can develop. This development then permits other, more complex, semantic relationships to arise. Thus, there exists an intimate relationship between cognition and language.

It does not follow, however, that intelligence - specifically I.Q. - affects language acquisition. The evidence is overwhelming that all children in all cultures develop language quite normally irrespective of other kinds of intelligence. Even severely mentally retarded children acquire language, though not to such an abstract level as normal children (Lenneberg, 1968). The only exception to this very general rule are children with severe and specific brain disorders (who may be quite intelligent in others ways).

Apparently, de Kanter/Baker confuse the oral and written modalities or, more precisely, what Cummins calls BICS (basic interpersonal communicative

skills) and CALP (cognitive-academic linguistic proficiency). Surely intelligence affects the latter. It does not affect the former.

De Kanter/Baker's confusion on this point is serious. From their position, they draw a number of inferences about language learning and its role in education which are quite erroneous. For example, their review attributes the superior performance of bilingual program students in Alice, Texas to the fact that they scored higher on Spanish tests and thus were "superior in ability" (II, 45). In discussing the importance of the relevant factors, they claim that English ability is "related to IQ in that more intelligent children learn more English on their own and/or learn it faster in school" (V, 7). (The footnote makes it clear that they are referring to oral language proficiency). Further on (V, 8), they assert that less able students have more trouble mastering English. Therefore, they claim, less able students (read "native born bilinguals") require a greater emphasis on English precisely because they are less able, and more able students (read "immigrant monolinguals") need only English, just because they are more able! Bilingual education, in their view, has no role except perhaps for immigrants with some schooling in their native country (V, 18). For all other language minority students, the treatment calls for immersion into linguistic oblivion as they hold their breath for the academic lifeline to be thrown.

Their recommendations must stand or fall on the validity of the joint propositions that more intelligent children learn oral language faster and better and that a high level of native oral language proficiency is evidence of higher intelligence. Not only is there no evidence of this (in the case of BICS or oral language skills), there is much evidence and theoretical support for the contrary position. De Kanter/Baker's recommendations in this regard are totally without merit.

Limits on Bilingualism. This idea is perhaps related to the role of cognitive ability in language learning since it implies that a child cannot learn a second language as well as the first due to cognitive overload. De Kanter/Baker do not offer this rationale, but accept explicitly the idea that second language learners cannot match the proficiency of native speakers. Immersion studies, they say, "suggest that a monolingual population enjoys a superiority in their native tongue that probably will never be matched by bilinguals" (V, 2). They assert that since a language minority child will require years of work to develop L2 fluency, it is "unreasonable to expect native-like fluency" (V, 9). From this they conclude that the goal of bilingual education is to be sure that the bilingual child succeeds in English speaking society and that this can be attained by language development "somewhere below the 50th percentile." This position and its theoretical underpinnings are quite unacceptable. There is no evidence whatsoever that, given the appropriate environmental support, a child cannot become totally proficient in more than one language. Indeed, there is much evidence from linguists' case studies that children can become fluently multilingual (e.g., Burling, 1959; Imedadze, 1967; Leopold, 1939-1949; Natalicio and Natalicio, 1971; Ravem, 1968; Wong-Fillmore, 1976).

De Kanter/Baker's position has many implications that must be rejected. One is that minority children should be satisfied with a lower level of English achievement, with all that this implies for equal participation in society. This is because, as will be demonstrated later, the child's academic limitation in the school language is reflected in a like limitation in the other language. Their suggestion essentially relegates minority language children indefinitely to the lower end of the academic spectrum. Consider the implications of this suggestion for placement in bilingual programs and for "mainstreaming". If one were to accept a proficiency level "somewhere below the 50th percentile," language

minority (LM) children with unacceptably low English proficiencies would be ineligible for special assistance. This is a radical departure from the notion of equal educational opportunity for linguistic minority children. It is another manifestation of the widespread belief that LM children should receive but minimal assistance in the form of special programs and that they must either make it in the monolingual system or not make it at all. This is contrary to Lau vs Nichols and, in defiance of this mandate, it is a challenge to the law. De Kanter/Baker propose that properly operated (immersion) programs should result in children becoming native speakers of English within a generation. That is, not only is the current bilingual generation to accept its position as a second class academic group, it must accept that it can leave that position only by relinquishing its own language.

This latter consequence of de Kanter/Baker's theorizing is at the crux of the debate on bilingual education. Critics of bilingual education such as Noel Epstein (1977) decry the supposed emphasis on language maintenance models in U.S. programs. De Kanter/Baker also claim that many programs are maintenance oriented and "devote an inordinate proportion of the day to practicing oral L1 skills (B, 5). The key word is "inordinate". The ideological perspective is that maintenance of L1 is incompatible with a philosophy of education that promotes assimilation to the English speaking norm. Even one hour a day, which is all that is presumed to be required to improve L1 skills (V, 14), is an "inordinate" amount.

Language minority educators, on the other hand have another perspective. They recognize that in the sociolinguistic milieu in the U.S., much more instruction than is currently available in and through L1 is required in order to prevent language loss. They are quite cognizant of the need and desirability to learn English - indeed to learn it to a high degree of proficiency - but are convinced that such a goal is completely compatible with the maintenance of L1. Some are adamant, in fact, that L1 maintenance, as one component of a culturally relevant

education, is the most powerful approach to education for LM children.

It is undeniable that the maternal language and culture comprise an extremely important referent for self concept, a fact which de Kanter/Baker fully recognize. The home language is "identified with 'significant others' who are very important in shaping the child's self concept. The degree to which significant others are associated with reading and writing is important to the development of self-concept and consequently, literacy" (I, 7). De Kanter/Baker recognize this also in attributing the success of the program studied by Modiano (1968, 1973) to the presence of teachers from the community.

Additionally, Hernández-Chávez has argued elsewhere (1978) that cultural maintenance is a crucial factor in the solidarity and strength of a community. A strong community - even one of largely poor and uneducated immigrants - can eventually attain a measure of self sufficiency. A weak one cannot. Depriving children of the opportunity to develop their language and culture as do virtually all language development programs in the U.S. - not excluding TBE - serves only to weaken their ties to their families and communities, in turn weakening the social structure of these communities. De Kanter/Baker are correct in stating that the educational problem for linguistic minorities is not solely one of language. It is the problem of making education effective in a socially and culturally meaningful way. The narrow emphasis on English-only learning, whether through immersion, ESL, or TBE is culturally genocidal and socially destructive.

We saw above that language and cognitive development are closely interdependent. Notwithstanding the evidence from the Canadian immersion programs which will be discussed presently, it follows that cognitive development will be weakened by instruction in a weaker language (Macnamara 1967) and will be enhanced by a language that the child knows well. This is not to say that learning cannot occur through a weaker language - or without language - only that such

learning is inferior.

In sum, the notion that there are limits to the ability of children to become fully bilingual is a dangerous one. Acceptance of the idea of cognitive limits leads naturally to educational policies that de-emphasize children's native language and promotes monolingualism and assimilation. It feeds on the fear that knowledge of another language - except in an academically elitist sense - detracts from the learning of English and full integration into American society. It conjures up the specter of separatism and subversiveness, breeding discrimination and divisiveness.

The Context of Language Learning. De Kanter/Baker consider a number of environmental factors as relevant to children's motivations for learning L2 and their resultant success in acquiring the second language. Among these are the relative statuses of L1 and L2 in society, which group the child belongs to, community and parental language use, SES, and parental attitudes toward the languages and toward school. We can divide these factors into two types: a factor of societal and community language use and attitudes; and a factor of social, linguistic, and attitudinal characteristics of the child and family.

This distinction is important for understanding the role of motivation in language learning. The term motivation implies an incentive to learn that is individually determined and realized. Yet, as we shall see, individual characteristics are of relatively minor importance in the majority-L2 context.

It is clear that societal attitudes and language use play a crucial role in L2 learning. In U.S. society, English is omnipresent in all institutions, even into the homes of linguistic minority people themselves. In schools, the workplace, and places of commerce, English is by far the principal language of intercourse. Even in communities in which a non-English language is dominant, rare are the institutions in which no English at all is used. The mass media including radio,

television, movies, and newspapers touch every corner of every community and constitute a powerful socializing force for English and Anglo-American values.

The social and cultural attraction of all these institutions exerts an inexorable pull on the motivations of linguistic minority children to learn the language. Indeed, given the innate faculté du langage and the ever present necessity, desire, and opportunity to interact in English, it is inevitable that these children, left to their own devices, will acquire oral proficiency in English naturally, to a high level of skill, and within a relatively few years. The exceptions to this generalization are limited. Children of migrants who are more isolated from American society may learn only a basic functional English and remain dominant in Spanish; adult and older adolescent immigrants, whose natural language aptitude has diminished because of their age (Lenneberg, 1967), may only learn survival L2 skills, depending on the sociolinguistic context.

Apart from such exceptions, linguistic minority pre-adolescents can and invariably do learn to speak English without the necessity of formal instruction. (Skrabanek, 1970; Thompson, 1974; Laosa, 1975). And even in those areas where non-English cultures and languages enjoy a vitality that is due to proximity of the cultural homeland, first generation immigrant children learn English and often eventually become dominant in this language. It is decidedly not the case that it takes three generations for children to shift in this way, a statement incorrectly attributed to Hernández-Chávez 1978 (V, 18). The actual point made by the latter was that L1 undergoes loss by the third generation and often even within the immigrant generation itself.

Given this pattern of pervasive influence of Anglo American culture that induces a nearly universal and natural learning of English, it is not only not necessary, it is erroneous in substantial respects, to attribute success in L2 learning to the second factor - characteristics of the learner's family. The above

pattern of learning occurs irrespective of such factors as SES, home language use, or parental attitudes toward culture, language, or school. These factors are influential to some extent in linguistic and cultural maintenance (though without institutional support, these factors are insufficient by themselves to promote intergenerational language maintenance. See Hernández-Chávez 1978). Even so, they have only limited impact. Low SES as well as high SES children successfully acquire L2; home language use affects the time at which children begin to learn English, but once they enter school, the environmental conditions including language use in the community become the determining factors in L2 acquisition.

Parental attitudes toward the languages and the school will affect academic learning in and through L2 (Cummins' CALP), in particular the acquisition of and progress in literacy. They may also affect the particular variety of English the children learn by instilling attitudes toward particular reference groups, though there is some evidence (Milon, 1974) that, parental attitudes notwithstanding, it is characteristics of the peer groups themselves that most strongly affect the variety learned. On the other hand, the evidence is meager that parent attitudes affect oral proficiency in L2 in the sort of context we are discussing. The evidence cited by de Kanter/Baker is either from foreign language rather than second language contexts, or is from minority-L2 contexts as in Canada. Since in these learning contexts, the environmental support for L2 is quite limited, the individual factors become much more important.

From the St. Lambert experience, de Kanter/Baker accept the idea that a second language is better learned in a segregated setting. The merits of integrated versus separate-but-equal education will not be discussed here.* What is at issue

* Integration is often a device to place the causes of low achievement of minority children in their need to interact with white children of presumably "superior ability" and, by implication, in their own inability to learn in all-black or all-Chicano or all-Asian settings. It thus disguises the more fundamental causes of poor performance which are poor schooling and the miseducation of children by an

are de Kanter/Baker's recommendations that a second language is best developed in a segregated setting. They reason that, given the Canadian experience, L2-dominant students inhibit L1-dominant students from participating fully in L2 class discussions. Therefore, they claim, L2 children make poor language models. This is contrary to sociolinguistic principles of language learning and to empirical evidence in majority-L2 contexts (Milon, 1974).

Beginning as early as four and five years of age, peers become increasingly important socializers, and in school age are much more important than adults. De Kanter/Baker's proposal does not take this into account, and fails to acknowledge the learning process by which children first incorporate language by active construction of it in comprehension followed by use of the new structures in speaking.

Structural Similarities and Learning. Languages can be related to each other by historical origin and geographic proximity. Thus Spanish and English are both Indo-European and Western and so are semantically and grammatically similar. Hindi is also Indo-European but its socio-cultural distance from Europe makes it less similar to English. Structuralist theory suggests that similar L2's are easier to learn than dissimilar L2's; that in dissimilar L2's, interference or negative transfer occurs due to contrasting structures. However, these theories have not been borne out by empirical work over the last decade on second language acquisition in children. This work (see in particular Hernández-Chávez 1972, 1977) has shown that in naturalistic contexts, children develop L2 structures virtually independently from those of L1. Interference plays a minimal role, and then principally in the development of phonological structures. Thus, de Kanter/Baker's recommendation that bilingual education not be used with children whose languages are unrelated to

inadequate and culturally unresponsive system. Integration may even exacerbate cultural insensitivity.

English (e.g., Indo-Chinese or American Indian languages) is based on principles that have been empirically and theoretically invalidated.

Summary. Several of de Kanter/Baker's recommendations derive from theoretical positions that are naive, have been invalidated, or are totally without foundation. On this bed of sand, the Report has raised a complex rationale for educational policy recommendations for linguistic minorities that must ultimately topple. Thus, taking Cummins' finding that L2 oral skills do not necessarily facilitate the transfer of written skills, de Kanter/Baker reason that no oral skills in either language are required to learn to read, an utterly false conclusion. They then use the controversy over the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis to assure us that non-language concepts are as easily learned non-verbally as with language. This is grasping at theoretical straws since even Whorf's strongest critics never claim that language and thought are independent. They goes so far as to assert, without the least theoretical basis, that language learning depends upon intelligence. It is obvious that they confuse the role of intelligence in the learning of CALP (academically oriented language) and of BICS (natural communication). They also claim that bilinguals cannot attain the same level of proficiency in L2 as monolinguals, presumably because of limitations on total mental capacity. In this, they ignore a large body of research and anecdotal evidence to the contrary.

De Kanter/Baker give great importance as relevant factors to the role in L2 development of the child's social and linguistic upbringing. This is in accord with a large body of educational theory that holds the child rather than the school responsible for his own poor education. Moreover, it fails to give due regard to external conditions in the sociolinguistic environment that are powerful determinants of L2 learning, overshadowing to a great extent familial factors of SES, language use, and language attitudes.

We are shelled by de Kanter/Baker with a veritable barrage of bad theory. They stretch and distort every serious and legitimate scholarly debate on language acquisition to conform to their own social and educational goals . There exist many arguments that could be made to support their basic position, but these would have to be political and philosophical, not linguistic and educational. And if they were made, they would show clearly that it is not the educational well being of LM children that is of concern so much as the support of deeply entrenched interests in the educational establishment.

III. PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

We now turn our attention from theory to practice. The bulk of de Kanter/Baker's review is devoted to a detailed evaluation of a fair number of bilingual education and immersion projects. It applies extremely stringent methodological criteria for determining whether or not a given study is acceptable as evidence for the efficacy of the type of program. Among these are control for certain relevant factors, many of which were discussed above; the problem of selection bias which involves control for the relevant factors, pre-test differences, voluntary participation, and student needs; the basis of comparison; the use of tests and gain scores; and the possibility of special effects such as the Hawthorne or the Pygmalion effects.

At the outset, it is important to say that this emphasis on methodological rigor is well placed. If educational research, especially in such a politically sensitive area as language minority education, is to have any effect on policy, it must be designed and implemented to demonstrate clearly and unequivocally the effects, if any, of the particular program. This is all the more the case because it is impossible to eliminate every source of bias.

Even so, we question whether research of any sort in this area can have a real effect on policy. Research studies, like psychiatric exams in a criminal trial, are paraded before policy makers to confirm decisions and positions that are taken on philosophical or political grounds and are basically predetermined (Ayala, 1981). Educational policy is made to serve economic or ideological purposes rather than to support sound pedagogy. Reasoned arguments, also, are heard through these same filters, with the result that facts are drowned out, theory is distorted, and evidence goes unheard.

Thus it is with de Kanter/Baker's review of the research. They are absolutely

correct in rejecting most of the studies reviewed as evidence for the efficacy of transitional bilingual education (TBE). Nor do we fault the Report for lauding the several studies on second language immersion (SLI)* as well-designed research. And we do not disagree with them on many of the interpretations of the evidence. But, precisely because of the depth and range of the analysis and the apparently overwhelming weight of the evidence, we are greatly concerned by their open lack of impartiality.

De Kanter/Baker are pro-immersion. This is not because the objective evidence leads them inevitably toward that stance; nor because linguistic or educational theories unavoidably point them in that direction; not even because of a concern for the proper education of LM children. The pro-immersion stance derives from the social and educational philosophy that the overriding goal of language minority education is to convert non-English speakers into monolingual English speakers. Only in this way do they believe will language minority children be able to function in American society. To be clear about the matter, we too consider the learning of English to be an important goal for LM children as this will permit fuller participation in society.

The most effective strategy available to us for improving a people's participation in the society is education, an education that encompasses an understanding of one's condition in society and one's value as a human being as well as the attainment of knowledge about the world around us. The goal of education is not just language learning; nor is it just academic achievement. The test of equality of an educational program designed for LM children is in whether or not it

* Since the de Kanter/Baker report will undoubtedly focus a great deal of attention on second language immersion, we find it convenient to abbreviate the term in this way. It introduces a new acronym in an acronym-filled field, but it will make discussion easier.

provides for a high level of achievement in the academic disciplines and the development of a positive self concept in relation to the child's family and community - the same test used for the education of language majority children. We presume a context of equality of opportunity, which Bell argues is the legitimizing ingredient in American social participation (Bell, 1980).

This is not to say, of course, that language development is unimportant. Quite the contrary. As we argued above, conceptual development, both in terms of knowledge and sociocultural understanding, is interdependent with language to a high degree. The primary language, as the principal vehicle for culture, transmits to the child his understanding of who he is within his social and cultural world. In addition, cross-cultural education is impossible without adequate L2 knowledge. Language is both the ear and the voice of cognition and is thus the most advanced faculty of learning. Nonetheless, it is important to recognize that, while language is the most efficient and powerful instrument of learning, it is not the ultimate goal.

Let us digress for a moment to explore the implications of this shift in goals from language minority education in a broad sense to minority education consisting only of language. The two educational models at issue are TBE and SLI. In TBE, the major approach is to instruct the child temporarily in his native language, meanwhile teaching him English until such time as this language can become the medium of instruction. There are a good many questions that can be raised about this approach. We will focus here on the question of language development and its relationship to the learning of subject matter concepts.

The language that a five-year-old child brings to the school is already extremely complex. It has a vocabulary of several thousand words that encode all manner of concepts including concrete and abstract ideas, relational terms, and forms that express the cultural experience of his speech community. Its gram-

matical structure, though not fully developed, represents highly abstract and complex semantic relations. Through this grammar and lexical store, the child organizes and interprets his reality and makes ever more precise inferences about the meanings that are communicated to him.

In order to comprehend the tasks that the school asks him to perform, the child must bring to bear all of this internalized knowledge. In particular, as a child begins to interpret graphic symbols in learning to read and write he must have recourse to the full conceptual structure that is mediated for him by oral language. The comprehension of the school tasks, in turn, serves as an important stimulus for advancing the child's linguistic development. It is obvious that such a process requires a much more sophisticated knowledge of language than most educators have heretofore believed.

For a second language learner to match the structural, semantic, and experiential knowledge of a five year old native speaker requires many years. To match that of his age-mates takes even longer. De Kanter/Baker recognize this fact (V, 9) though they interpret it to mean that the child must be satisfied with an L2 academic achievement below the 50th percentile. We interpret this to mean that the L2 child is at an inherent disadvantage to the L1 child in advancing his conceptual development.

In TBE programs, the child is typically given from one to three years of intensive English instruction with decreasing amounts of subject matter instruction through the medium of L1. For many reasons, the latter is usually not of the same level of quality as that given to monolingual English speakers. The English instruction usually results in a level of oral proficiency that allows the child to function reasonably well in face-to-face communication. However, it is by no means adequate for the complex tasks of academic learning. But TBE relies on oral language proficiency tests, which measure only a restricted and rudimentary

knowlege of oral language, as evidence that children are ready to be "mainstreamed" at the earliest possible moment. Because of these practices, TBE fails to develop the child linguistically or conceptually in either language, and the educational deficit grows. In this way TBE fails the child.

With SLI, the gap is widened. The concepts that the child is presumably taught as he is being taught L1 are necessarily of the lowest order since the idea is to teach just those concepts that the child can handle linguistically without "submersion". Since at school entry, the child would just be beginning to learn the school language, it follows that the concepts the child can learn through it are only the ones that can be simply introduced or those which the teacher guesses the child already knows in his first language. Since it will take several years to bring the L2 into parity with the conceptual level of L1 at school entry, the child's conceptual development is stifled, with the result that, when linguistic parity is finally reached, if ever, the educational gap between LM and majority language children becomes an abyss.

The effect of this process can also be devastating linguistically. As we have pointed out, cognition is necessary for language to develop, and the possession of language permits the understanding and acquisition of higher level concepts. If the L1 is used sparingly for conceptual development, as it is in TBE and would be in SLI, it will tend to be overpowered by the sociolinguistically supported L2. And if the L2 is not yet developed to the point at which it is at least adequately efficient for learning, the child will have been stripped of any appropriate vehicle for advanced conceptual development - the condition of "semilingualism" described by Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976, 1977). Because of this negative effect, and purely from an educational standpoint, the L1 should be allowed to develop to its fullest potential. Neither TBE nor SLI can alleviate the problem of semilingualism.

Second Language Immersion (SLI). Let us now return to the question of the

evaluation of TBE and SLI projects. De Kanter/Baker review four immersion programs - two in Canada and two in the U.S. The Barik and Swain study compared immersion in French as the second language to an FSL program, i.e. all instruction in English L1 except for one period per day of French as a Second Language. In the third year of the study, one hour of L1 instruction was added for the immersion group. The findings were that the SLI students were superior in all grades to the FSL students - a totally unsurprising finding since both the time spent in learning French and the method of instruction were different. What is surprising is that de Kanter/Baker accept this as evidence for the effectiveness of SLI, especially since there was non-random selection, cohorts were used as comparisons, and the comparison was made with FSL rather than with either submersion or TBE. All these same factors are listed by de Kanter/Baker as criteria for the rejection of studies in their review.

A program in Culver City, California is also described briefly in support of L2 immersion. De Kanter/Baker cite superior performance by program students in every area by the sixth grade. What they fail to mention are the possibly determining factors of SES (the school attracts basically middle class children) or the Hawthorne effect. In addition the project children were Anglo students learning Spanish for enrichment, a totally different circumstance than minority students in a majority L2 context. We cannot accept the results of this program as in any way applicable to the latter.

De Kanter/Baker rely most heavily on the St. Lambert experiment to demonstrate that SLI is an effective approach to second language learning. At Grade 4 the experimental children were lower than the French controls, though not significantly so, on listening comprehension and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. However, they were significantly lower on overall expression, grammar, enunciation, liaison, rhythm and intonation, and decoding of children's descriptions.

On the Test de Rendement en Francais their mean was at the 60th percentile compared to Montreal norms. De Kanter/Baker interpret this as "average," yet neither she nor Lambert et al. take into account that the Montreal norms are based on children from all SES and I.Q. levels, so this mean needs to be interpreted quite differently.

In L1 (English), the experimental children performed as well as English controls on most of the sub-tests. But they were below the controls in the proportion of nouns, adjectives and verbs used in constructing stories. They were also below the controls in decoding children's descriptions.

These results show that even in the optimal learning conditions of the St. Lambert program, the immersion children performed more poorly in English (L1) on a few tasks and more poorly in French (L2) on many tasks. These children had many advantages: a well designed experimental program (de Kanter/Baker do not mention the strong possibility of Hawthorne or novelty effects), volunteerism and very enthusiastic parents (a criterion that de Kanter/Baker use to reject many TBE studies), middle class social standing, and an L1 that is the socially, culturally, politically, and economically dominant language.

Given the goals of the researchers - the development of an enrichment bilingualism with little or no deleterious effects on the native language, intelligence, or academic achievement - the results are outstanding. As a model for linguistic minority education in the U.S. the program is far from ideal. Some retardation in L1 occurs in St. Lambert; a great deal of language loss would be inevitable in the U.S. sociolinguistic setting. After four years (six years by the data available to de Kanter/Baker), L2 is deficient in many areas. This is a serious indictment of the program as a model for the kind of program de Kanter/Baker envision in the U.S. which has L2 learning as its primary goal. The principal investigator of the St. Lambert studies concurs:

> "I would agree with that. It is totally wrong to ignore the contextual factors of the St. Lambert experiment in evaluating the efficacy of an immersion approach in the United States public education context. These factors include the higher prestige of the L1 of the immersion students, a factor which is reversed in the non-English speaking children in the U.S.; the middle-class status and average educational attainment of the parents of those children, which do not match the characteristics of the parents of the LEP/NEP students in the U.S. Schools." (Lambert, W., Personal communication, December, 1981.)

Deficiencies in L2 after several years of immersion have important repercussions for the education and general cognitive development of linguistic minority children. Academic achievement - even in mathematics - demands a high level of literacy in the language of instruction. While this literacy is being developed, achievement necessarily suffers. And if literacy does not reach the norm even after a number of years of instruction, the cumulative effects of the deficit will have obvious consequences. High levels of literacy depend on the foundation laid in early experiences in learning to read and to write. If these are retarded through SLI or other ineffective approaches, the deficit in literacy and academic subjects is compounded.

The fourth immersion study that de Kanter/Baker evaluates is the McAllen, Texas project. In this experiment, it was found that bilingual children scored impressive gains in English over similar children in a TBE program. The children in both the experimental and control groups were of rural low-SES backgrounds, and inclusion in the program was by random assignment. Thus, the results are more credible than those of many other such studies in the U.S.

The problem lies in considering these findings to support the superiority of SLI over TBE or ESL as appropriate programs for most linguistic minority children. First is the fact that the "tremendous gains" were recorded in kindergarten during

the first year of the project. In their comments on the Nigerian study (Yoloye, 1977; Ojerinde, 1978), de Kanter/Baker caution against accepting results from the first year of a program. They also reject Legarreta's (1979) results on the basis that "how kindergarten kids talk is of only marginal interest." Yet for the McAllen study they accept both of these criteria as strong evidence of the effectiveness of SLI. Secondly, the participants in the program were bilinguals who were "comparably limited in both languages," i.e. presumably the children were native speakers of English since they entered kindergarten with English skills equivalent to their Spanish skills. A question arises as to what "comparably limited" means. The implication is that the children were deficient in oral proficiency in both languages. Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa have described "semilingualism" in Sweden as the result of improper educational programs, but here is no suggestion in their work that such a condition exists in a natural language learning setting. Indeed, the notion that normal children do not have a fully developed natural language runs counter to all psycholinguistic and linguistic theoretical research. Several explanations for this finding of the McAllen study suggest themselves, including inadequacy or incomparability of the tests used, faulty administration of the tests in a sociolinguistically inappropriate setting, use of norms for English proficiency that are different from the bilingual norms described by Haugen (1956), or improper interpretation of the tests. If the TBE program students were in fact English dominant, the type of instruction may have been inappropriate. This interpretation is supported by the fact that there were initial differences in language proficiency between the experimental and control groups.

Be that as it may, the relatively high level of English at program inception makes the McAllen SLI program an extremely poor model for the more general case in which linguistic minority children arrive at school dominant in Spanish. De Kanter/Baker assert that "very few (non-English-speaking children) may be mono-

linguals" (II, 23). but cite no sources for such a statement. While it is true that many Chicano children have English as L1, it is also true that the vast majority of such children have Spanish as their first language and have at most a rudimentary knowledge of English at school entry (California Schools Language Census, 1981).

A third consideration is that students were given Spanish-only instruction for 20% of the school day. De Kanter/Baker define immersion as having "all instruction...in L2" with L1 "never spoken by the teacher and subject area instruction is given in L2 from the beginning" (II, 2). Clearly, the McAllen program is not SLI; it is a form of bilingual education. So, the comparisons made are between two different methods of bilingual instruction.

In fact, in both the McAllen and the St. Lambert studies, L1 instruction was systematically provided for a substantial portion of each school day. This is the fundamental definition of bilingual education. Differences in bilingual programs arise out of the particular model that is actually used: concurrent, alternate days, alternate half-days, or whatever; and the particular methods used for teaching English: direct approach, ESL, natural L2 learning, etc.

Thus, the programs that de Kanter/Baker cite as evidence for the efficacy of immersion are, in fact, not immersion at all in the sense that their review advocates for linguistic minority education. They are a form of bilingual education - indeed, a form of maintenance bilingual education in the context of L2 enrichment since for all except the McAllen program, L1 maintenance and development is a given. It is highly questionable whether this enrichment model is appropriate for linguistic minorities in the U.S. It is even more questionable to advocate a greatly different model (SLI) on the basis of these studies.

Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE). De Kanter/Baker repeatedly assert that there is no research evidence that TBE is an effective model. From time to

time, they modify this categorical statement by saying there is no "conclusive proof" or no "compelling evidence" or that a study is only "suggestive" as evidence. Their main point is that none of the studies reviewed is acceptable as evidence that TBE and, by extension, other models of bilingual education works. We are not so convinced, either, that TBE is the best educational approach for linguistic minority children. (See Hernández-Chávez 1978, 1979). In general, TBE is neither hide nor hair, ineffective as an English instructional program and incomplete as an academic program. Its faults are that, in its precipitous rush to "mainstream" pupils, it does not lay a sound enough foundation in English skills before students are transfered and, at the same time, it fails to develop the child's L1 and his cognitive abilities through L1 to the full capabilities of that language . The faults are inherent in the philosophy, legislation, and in the implementing regulations of Title VII and the variety of state laws patterned on it. We may add to this the theoretically unsound, contradictory, and badly implemented methods and the often culturally insensitive curricula and techniques that are used. It is little wonder that no "conclusive proof" exists of the efficacy of TBE.

Our major criticism of de Kanter/Baker's review in this area are (1) that there are several good studies of reasonably good programs that de Kanter/Baker reject on questionable methodological or theoretical grounds, (2) that evaluation criteria are applied unevenly - very stringently for positive results, flexibly for negative results, and (3) that from the lack of "compelling evidence" for TBE, their review rejects bilingual education as a viable approach and insists that only immersion works better than nothing at all.

As an example of the first point, de Kanter/Baker dismiss the favorable results of Plante's (1976) study mainly on the grounds that one-half of the control group was retained at least once in two years of the study. They state, "this experience renders the GE scores meaningless" (II, 37). Not quite. If anything, the

retained students should demonstrate higher GE scores the second time around which would mitigate the positive results of the experimental group. These results should then be given more credence rather than being dismissed.

Similarly, the Alice, Texas study is considered invalid because project students scored higher on Spanish pre-tests. De Kanter/Baker explain away the positive results of the study on the basis that, because of higher Spanish proficiency, the project students were "superior in ability." We have discussed above why this is an unwarranted interpretation since there is no evidence whatsoever that degree of first language dominance affects intelligence.

Legarreta found that bilingual programs were superior to submersion, and ESL programs superior to those without ESL. These findings are rejected because "the effects are never separated." This statement is curious because, of the five methods studied, one was submersion without ESL and another was submersion with ESL. In addition, of the two concurrent bilingual programs, one had ESL and the other did not. Thus, a direct comparison can be made of the effects of ESL in both kinds of programs.

De Kanter/Baker then question a major finding that the balanced group outperformed the un-balanced group on English skills. This "does not make sense" because "more English instruction led to poorer performance." They are correct in their analysis that there is a confusion of effects between the balanced/unbalanced and the alternate immersion/concurrent groups. The concurrent group had more English and was thus unbalanced. The fact remains that in comparing the two approaches - however one designates them - one is superior to the other both in the development of L1 skills and in developing L2 skills.

De Kanter/Baker use much lighter criticism of those studies that show no positive effects of bilingual education. Thus, the Salviani (1977) study is "limited to some degree by the failure to control relevant factors and by selection bias.." On

the other hand, del Buono's (1971) and Leyba's (1978) studies which have similar problems but showed positive results, are emphatically rejected. Del Buono's results "must be taken with extreme caution," and Leyba's study "offers scant, if any, support for...bilingual education."

The Curtis study (1980) found that project students fell further behind national norms than children not in the project. Finding that 5th graders lost more than did 4th graders, de Kanter/Baker "presume" that the selection process was the same and conclude that bilingual education "has not helped." The proper conclusion is that the study provides no evidence either way, especially because of de Kanter/Baker's lengthy discussion on why the use of national norms is inappropriate.

De Kanter/Baker devote a great deal of space answering certain criticisms of the AIR study which showed a variety of negative effects for Title VII projects. They feel that the AIR study is "justified to draw (its) conclusions." Yet they do not even discuss AIR's comparison of scores to national norms which elsewhere they consider a serious methodological fault. For example, they reject the Corpus Christi study (1980) and Rimm (1980) principally on this basis, and it was one of the factors cited for rejecting Trevino (1968). Whatever the merits of using norm-referenced versus criterion-referenced designs, the inconsistency in applying their own criteria is evidence of a serious a priori bias against positive effects for bilingual education.

Finally, it is important to state that de Kanter/Baker's review of the various evaluations of TBE and SLI is generally sound and carefully done. We agree that the evidence is scarce for the effectiveness of TBE. But the evidence for SLI is even less convincing if the intent is to generalize it to the U.S. setting. One of our principal arguments with the de Kanter/Baker review is that, from the poor evidence on TBE and the inapplicable evidence on SLI, it attempts to make the

strongest possible case for SLI. That the experimental case has not been adequately made for TBE is poor reason to recommend that another, untried, approach is preferable, much less to insist, as de Kanter/Baker do, that it is the only effective approach. We must resist the impulse to allow the pendulum to swing back and must instead seek ways of benefiting from the forward momentum and the knowledge gathered in the last few years, proposing in the process an improvement of the practices.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In drawing up a set of policy recommendations regarding language and education, the policy analyst must not just be aware of the limited effects that can be expected from a given educational method. The analyst must also be aware of other related policies being formulated, the pressures supporting their formulation, and the needs of the nation.

Federal immigration policy, for example, has a sociolinguistic impact upon local and state educational agencies of such great proportions that the need to provide special services to newly arrived populations preempts the debate of the educational policymakers. Submersion is illegal, but because of immigration policies, it is now widely practiced. Often, this is not due to malice or lack of knowlege on the part of schools, but to lack of resources that could be shifted to areas of need quickly enough to permit some form of bilingual education to take place from the start. Similarly, federal policy dealing with refugee resettlement disperses children with common needs across the nation to localities where the resources to meet their needs are often not present. And where children have these needs, as is clearly the case in the above examples, other sectors of government are acting to affect educational policy, which in turn must account for those effects in its own policy planning.

The de Kanter/Baker review is like a two-barreled scattergun, attempting to target second language immersion (SLI) as the principal alternative to language minority education and to riddle with holes those studies that find bilingual education an appropriate approach for those same children. It misses the mark with both barrels.

The evidence that is presented in favor of SLI is heavily tainted in many ways. The immersion studies that the review describes are well designed and well

implemented, but they are not without damaging flaws nor are their results clear cut. Using similar criteria to those that the review applied to bilingual education programs, the one minority immersion program described should be rejected as providing no evidence for the efficacy of that type of program. It spanned only one year, its level was kindergarten, the children were described as bilingual at school entry, and there were important differences between the control and experimental groups. Thus, these kinds of studies provide no evidence either for or against the efficacy of SLI as an educational model for language minority children who are dominant in their L1. Regardless of the fact that some form of SLI is practiced in local schools across the country as an unlawful substitute for programs of bilingual education, a policy leap which would validate these ad-hoc practices is not warranted by the evidence presented.

Despite certain rhetorical excesses, de Kanter/Baker's principal conclusion with regard to TBE is that there exists insufficient evidence to prove that it is the most effective approach for language minority children. With that, we can agree. The evidence is not conclusive. We can also agree that bilingual education has not yet been fairly tested. What have been tested, by and large, are pale versions of what effective bilingual education programs could and should be.

Yet even these minimal efforts at bilingual education have not been fully studied. There still are 48 unreported sets of findings to look through - after they have been made public to Congress - before we can say which theoretical or experimental hypotheses that we now have are supported in fact. We still have many questions about how bilingual education compares to the regular school program for majority language children. We suggest that this is the fairest test of equal educational opportunity in practice.

Here is the challenge: to seek a system of public education whereby the child who comes from a non-majority group may learn in the way that is best for the

child rather than in a way that is best for the school, a way by which the child can develop to the fullest his innate intellectual abilities. TBE is no panacea. In reality, it is little more than an educational placebo, giving the impression of a powerful medicine though helping very little. But we clutch at every hint of a positive effect, because at least TBE recognizes that the sources of the child's educational problems are not within the child himself but rather in an inappropriate and unresponsive educational system. We do not advocate it or defend it because it is so good but because it is better than anything we now have. At the same time, to advocate immersion - especially on the basis of such meager research support - is to regress to the melting pot social and educational theories of the past which held that people from other cultures must be refashioned into the All-American image, and to accomplish this, their old identities must be destroyed. Submersion education has attempted to do just this and it has failed, just as will immersion.

Then, what alternatives exist? The de Kanter/Baker review alludes in passing to one that is very promising and that has strong theoretical support. However, because of their single-minded advocacy of immersion as the final solution to the "language problem" (V, 10), it fails to recognize the alternative seriously or to develop it. This most logical of alternatives is L1 or vernacular education. The results of the Nigerian study (Yoloye, 1977; Ojerinde, 1978) show that students schooled in L1 outperformed those switching to L2 in mathematics, science, and social studies, with no differences in English L2. De Kanter/Baker suggest that the implications of this study for the U.S. are that all instruction should be provided in L1. Later, in discussing alternative methods, they make the following interesting statement:

> "There is no reason to believe students in the minority-majority setting could not be successfully educated entirely in L1 with English taught as a foreign language (EFL).

> After 12 years of such instruction their English skills should be sufficient to get by in the English speaking world. Content learning would not have been inhibited during their schooling by the problems of having to shift languages to acquire content" (V, 20).

We agree wholeheartedly. Our only argument is with the notion of EFL and the statement that after 12 years, English would be sufficient only to get by. In American society, English is a second language, not a foreign language either in terms of teaching methodology or sociolinguistic reality. Natural second language techniques, a la immersion, would be most compatible with an L1 education, and together with the forceful presence of English in all spheres of activity, students would become totally bilingual, not just get by. Indeed, some research points to positive transfer of academic linguistic skills (CALP), and, with respect to achievement in other areas, the overriding criterion is that it be attained at a high level and not the language in which it is attained. The problems with such a system would not be few. But there are also many problems with every other approach to linguistic minority education, with totally inadequate results.

In a way, the resources that have been developed through TBE can serve as the initial basis of a vernacular system. The likelihood that such a system will be developed for the nation as a whole, would depend in large measure upon federal policy in other areas, both for its enactment and its success. First, Congress would have to decide on S1817 and HR3231 currently being proposed as national defense issues. Both bills encourage the creation of foreign language programs in strategically useful languages: Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, Russian - some of the very languages for which the vernacular L1 schools would be needed. A two-way bilingual program might result from the response of some school systems to the policy guidance given by Congress if it enacts these two bills, and this response would assist in refocusing schools upon the two-way cross-lingual aspects of such

an education and its cross-cultural effects.

Other publicly announced policies of influential academic associations can bring functional power to the vernacular school idea, giving it a chance to work. The recent statement by the Council on Anthropology and Education of the American Anthropological Association supports the cross-cultural education concept as sound and based upon scientific evidence, a concept which would have to be in place in a two-way vernacular foreign language school before it could succeed. It would be interesting to see from the emerging psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and pedagogical data, just how valid is the concept of prolonged dual language development in the formation of academically successful students. This finding should emerge from the Significant Features Study in time to inform S1817 and HR3231 debate.

Our own Bilingual Education Community Study Project will provide data on the impact of TBE upon the community that adopts it, suggesting ways in which community sociology, history, economics and linguistics interact to support or hinder the effectiveness of an educational program. A more targeted policy might emerge from these findings. But the research, to have any meaning, must look for an approach that has at least a reasonable chance of success in educating linguistic minority children. To use de Kanter's words, though with a very different intent, "the question is whether to focus on the temporary phenomena" - immediate L2 acquisition - "or on the final results" - providing a system of education for linguistic minorities that will allow the full development of their intellectual abilities in a context that is culturally and socially supportive. Our own view is that both of the latter criteria are equivalent.

c/s

REFERENCES*

Ayala, Armando. 1981. A Comparative Analysis of the 1974 Bilingual Education Act and the Recommended Changes by Field Practitioners of the Final 1978 Reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act. Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco.

Bell, Daniel. 1980. The Winding Passage. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc.

Burling, Robbins. 1959. Language development of a Garo- and English-speaking child. Word 15, 45-68.

California Department of Education. 1981. California Schools Language Census 1981. Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Danoff, M. 1978. Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish-English Bilingual Education Program. Palo Alto: American Institutes for Research.

Epstein, Noel. 1977. Language, Ethnicity and the Schools: Policy alternatives for bilingual-bicultural education. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, The George Washington University.

Haugen, Einar. 1956. Bilingualism in the Americas: A bibliography and research guide. Publication of the American Dialect Society #26. University of Alabama: University Press.

Hernández-Chávez, Eduardo. 1978. Language maintenance, bilingual education, and philosophies of bilingualism in the United States. In James Alatis (ed.), International Dimensions of Bilingual Education. GURT, 1978. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. Pp. 527-550.

_____ 1977. The Acquisition of Grammatical Structure by a Mexican American Child Learning English. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

_____ 1972. Early code separation in the acquisition of a second language. Paper presented to the Stanford Child Language Research Form.

Laosa, Luis. 1975. Bilingualism in three United States Hispanic groups: Contextual use of language by children and adults in their families. Journal of Educational Psychology 67:5. 617-627.

Lambert, W. and Tucker, R. 1972. Bilingual Education of Children. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House,

Lenneberg, Eric. 1967. Biological Foundations of Language. New York: John Wiley

Leopold, Werner F. 1939-1949. Speech development of a bilingual child: A linguist's record. Vol. I, Vocabulary growth in the first two years. Vol. II, Sound-learning in the first two years. Vol. III, Grammar and general problems in the first two years. Vol. IV, Diary from age 2. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.

Macnamara, John. 1967. The effects of instruction in a weaker language. Journal of Social Issues 23:2. 121-135.

Milon, John. 1974. The development of negation in English by a second language learner. TESOL Quarterly 8, 137-143.

Natalicio, Diana S. and Luiz F.S. Natalicio. 1971. A comparative study of English pluralization by native and non-native English speakers. Child Development 42, 1302-1306.

Ravem, Roar. 1968. Language acquisition in second language environment. IRAL 6, 175-185.

Reagan, Ronald. Inauguration Address, January, 1981.

Skrabanek, R.L. 1970. Language maintenance among Mexican-Americans. International Journal of Comparative Sociology 11. 272-282.

Slobin, Dan I. 1973. Cognitive prerequisites for the development of grammar. In Charles A. Ferguson and Dan I. Slobin (eds.), Studies of Child Language Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. Pp. 175-208.

Stallings, Jane. 1974. Effects and Program Implementation in Compensatory Education. Palo Alto: Stanford Research International.

Thompson, Roger. 1974. Mexican American language loyalty and the validity of the 1970 census. In Garland Bills (ed.) Southwest Areal Linguistics. San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism. Pp. 65-78.

* Only those references are included that are not listed in the de Kanter/Baker report.